

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-13, 15-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 7, and 14 were canceled; claims 1, 5, 8, 13, 15, and 18 were amended. Claims 1, 13, and 18 are amended to incorporate features originally presented in claims 4 and 7, and claims 5, 8, and 15 are amended for proper dependency. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. Objection to Claims**

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 1 has been rewritten to overcome this objection as described above. Independent claims 13 and 18 have been rewritten in a similar manner for the same purpose.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Chawla et al.*, System with Methodology for Executing Relational Operations Over Relational Data and Data Retrieved from Soap Operation, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0181537 A1 (September 14, 2004) (hereinafter "*Chawla*"). This rejection is respectfully overcome.

The Examiner stated:

As per claim 1, Chawla et al. teaches "receiving a request from a client to perform an action on the object in the data store; responsive to receiving the request, sending an extensible markup language request message to an adaptor for processing, wherein the extensible markup language request message adheres to a set of generic schemas" (see paragraph [0066]-[0067] and [0080]) "receiving an extensible markup language response message from the adaptor, wherein the extensible markup language response message adheres to the set of generic schemas; and responsive to receiving the extensible markup language response message, returning resulting values obtained from the response message to the client" (see paragraph [0084] and [0096]).

Office Action, dated September 14, 2006, page 3.

Amended claim 1 is as follows:

1. A method in a data processing system for generating a query statement at run time to submit and retrieve information of an object in a data store, the method comprising:
  - receiving a request from a client to perform an action on the object in the data store;
  - responsive to receiving the request, sending an extensible markup language request message to an adaptor for processing, wherein the extensible markup language request message adheres to a set of generic schemas including a plurality of row sets, and wherein a row set includes a plurality of rows, and wherein a row of the plurality of rows includes a plurality of columns, and wherein a column includes a name and a value;
  - receiving an extensible markup language response message from the adaptor, wherein the extensible markup language response message adheres to the set of generic schemas; and
  - responsive to receiving the extensible markup language response message, returning resulting values obtained from the response message to the client.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of original claims 1, 4, and 7. The prior art does not suggest, teach or fairly suggest the elements of claim 1, including responsive to receiving the request, sending an extensible markup language request message to an adaptor for processing, wherein the extensible markup language request message adheres to a set of generic schemas including a plurality of row sets, wherein a row set includes a plurality of rows and wherein a row of the plurality of rows includes a plurality of columns, wherein a column includes a name and a value. Every element of the claim is not identically disclosed or described by the prior art. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

Independent claim 13 recites subject matter addressed above with respect to claim 1. Claim 13 has been amended in proper form to include all of the limitations of original claims 7, 13, and 14 and is allowable for similar reasons. Claim 18 has been amended in proper form to include all of the limitations of original claims 4, 7, and 18. Since claims 2-3, 5-12, 15-17, and 19-20 depend from claims 1, 13 and 18 respectfully, the same distinctions between the prior art and the invention recited in claims 2-3, 5-12, 15-17, and 19-20 apply for these claims.

### **III. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over *Chawla* and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: December 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Mary Adams-Moe/

Mary Adams-Moe  
Reg. No. 57,883  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants